



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Application	County of Glenn	County	Glenn
Project Title	Cooperative Program of Groundwater Modeling and Monitoring Well installation	Grant Request	\$ 247,072.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 254,672.00

Project Description: The proposed project creates a network of dedicated monitoring wells to provide valuable data to support management decisions in the county. The project also includes a modeling component that will be used as the basis for predicting groundwater depletion and changes over time and may lead to the development of recharge facilities.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	3
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	30

- **GWMP or Program:** The Glenn County GWMP was adopted February 20, 2000, as Ordinance No. 1115 (documentation of ordinance is provided).
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Applicant does not provide an adequately detailed description of the proposed project. For instance: 1) the proposal includes the installation of a multi-completion monitoring well. However, the details of the well could not be found in this section (including basic construction elements like the number of nested wells being proposed). Additionally, in regard to estimated depth of the proposed well, applicant simply states: “Where possible, monitoring well test boreholes will go as deep as funding allows...,” without providing further information or justification; 2) the description pertaining to the modeling effort being proposed lacks the specific details required to determine the actual actions being proposed; and 3) The need for and merit of the monitoring well installation is demonstrated, but the lack of details in the description of the modeling project make defining a definite benefit of that portion of the project difficult.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The modeling effort being proposed is insufficiently detailed. For instance, the modeling effort does not define the model to be used or describe what modifications (additional data) will be necessary for the model to produce the desired predictive results; further, this effort lacks appropriate sub-task break-down (for example, Task 1 is: “Data Review and Modeling”). This makes it difficult to gain a clear understanding of the specific tasks to be completed under this task, what the product or deliverable will be, and does not clearly present “a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project” as required by the PSP. While each task has a “Task Deliverable” section, sometimes deliverables are detailed in the body of the task description, but do not appear in the deliverable section, which is confusing. Additionally, some task deliverables are vague. For example, for Task 1 – it is not clear what the deliverable will be, possibly a report, a memorandum, or something else. Applicant does not sufficiently describe the monitoring well construction details (importantly, the number of wells to be constructed, and anticipated depth), but rather references a Figure (Fig. 5.3, provided) which includes this information. No procedure for disseminating the information gained by the proposed project was mentioned in the application.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. While a detailed budget table is provided (that includes labor categories, hourly rates, labor time estimates, and subcontractor estimates), it is not entirely clear how the estimates for some Tasks were derived. For instance, for Task 4 (Well Drilling/Well Construction), no subcontractor estimate is provided and the explanation of cost provided is inadequate. While applicant states: “The project rates used to estimate the project budget are based on the consultant rates used for the recently completed and/or nearly completed projects the County is engaged in” it is not clear that this refers to the contractor estimate provided for drilling (Task 4), and if so, whether it was for a similar drilling project. The budget table includes “Glenn County Administration (5% of Project Cost) for an amount of \$12, 127; however, there is no associated task described in Att. 5, Work Plan.
- **Schedule:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Applicant does not demonstrate a readiness to proceed when funding becomes available, as required by PSP (although the timeline is within that specified by the PSP), but rather merely states: “the project is assumed to begin in April 2013....”. Applicant does not “Explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule...” as required by PSP. Also, applicant does not explain how the schedule was derived, as required by the PSP. Schedule is generally consistent with the work plan and budget (albeit it does contain more subtasks).
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant demonstrates that appropriate and generally well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: using registered geologist and professional engineers as appropriate for the proposed project (including final well construction design by a CA Professional Geologist); using well construction materials that conform to DWR Monitoring Well Standards (Bulletin 74-90); logging drill cuttings according to the Unified Soil Classification System; and using standard protocol to calibrate monitoring equipment used during well development.
- **Past Performance:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Although applicant provides several examples of experience implementing projects, they do not discuss whether or not any of the projects listed were “completed within the time allotted and within the budget provided,” as required by the PSP. While applicant notes that three previous LGA grants were undertaken and completed, no documentation (such as DWR Performance Evaluation forms) was provided to support successful completion of the project. Further, no documentation is provided that would indicate their performance on any of the project examples provided.